

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/284,690

**Applicant(s)**

ROUSSEAU, LOUIS

**Examiner**

Alexa A. Doroshenk

**Art Unit**

1764

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alexa A. Doroshenk.(3) Megan McCoy.(2) Dan Hart.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 16 May 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 2-4 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Art of Record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

##### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

##### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney presented proposed amendments (attached) to the claims. Discussed changing "projections" to "region" and adding limitation reciting "resulting from a difference in diameter between said cylinder and the diameter of the large base of the truncated cone". Also proposed adding a dependent claim wherein said region comprises a conical section between said cylinder and said truncated cone. Examiner indicated that the changes appear to overcome the 102 rejection and appear to be supported by the specification.

Louis J. Knobbe\*  
Don W. Martens\*  
Gordon H. Olson\*  
James B. Bear  
Darrell L. Olson\*  
William B. Bunker  
William H. Nieman  
Arthur S. Rose  
James F. Lesniak  
Ned A. Israelson  
Drew S. Hamilton  
Jerry T. Sewell  
John B. Sganga, Jr.  
Edward A. Schlatter  
Gerard von Hoffmann  
Joseph R. Re  
Catherine J. Holland  
John M. Carson  
Karen Vogel Wall  
Andrew M. Simpson  
Jeffrey L. Van Hoosear  
Daniel E. Altman  
Marguerite L. Gunn  
Stephen C. Jensen  
Vito A. Canuso III  
William H. Shreve  
Lynda J. Zadra-Symest  
Steven J. Natapolsky  
Paul A. Stewart  
Joseph F. Jennings  
Craig S. Summers  
AnneMarie Kaiser  
Brenton R. Babcock  
Thomas F. Smegal, Jr.  
Michael H. Trenholm  
Diane M. Reed  
Ronald J. Schoenbaum  
John R. King  
Frederick S. Beretta  
Nancy W. Vensko  
John P. Glezentanner  
Adolf S. Akhtar  
Ginger R. Orger  
Thomas R. Arno  
David N. Weiss  
Daniel Hart, Ph.D.  
Douglas G. Muehlhauser  
Lori Lee Yamato

Michael K. Friedland  
Dale C. Hunt, Ph.D.  
Richard E. Campbell  
Paul D. Tripodi II  
Stacey R. Halpern  
Lee W. Henderson, Ph.D.  
Mark M. Abumari  
Jon W. Gurka  
John W. Holcomb  
Joseph M. Reisman, Ph.D.  
Michael L. Fuller  
Deborah S. Shepherd  
Eric M. Nelson  
Mark R. Benedict, Ph.D.  
Paul N. Conover  
Robert J. Roby  
Sabing H. Lee  
Karoline A. Delaney  
James J. Mullen III, Ph.D.  
Joseph S. Cianfrani  
William R. Zimmerman  
Glen L. Nuttall  
Eric S. Furman, Ph.D.  
Tirzah Abé Lowe  
Alexander Franco  
Sanjivpal S. Gill  
Susan Moss Nalland  
James W. Mill, M.D.  
Rose M. Thlesson, Ph.D.  
Michael A. Gullana  
Mark J. Keriz  
Rabinder N. Narula  
Bruce S. Itchkawitz, Ph.D.  
Peter M. Midgley  
Thomas S. McClenahan  
Michael S. Okamoto  
John M. Grover  
Mallory K. De Merlier  
Irfan A. Lateef  
Amy C. Christenson  
Sharon S. Ng  
Mark J. Gallagher, Ph.D.  
David G. Jankowski, Ph.D.  
Brian C. Horne  
Payson J. LeMelleur  
Diana W. Prince  
Shella N. Swaroop  
Ben A. Katzenellenbogen

# Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear

Intellectual Property Law

550 West C Street  
Suite 1200  
San Diego CA 92101  
Tel 619-235-8550  
Fax 619-235-0176  
knob.com

May 14, 2002

## ORIGINAL WILL FOLLOW VIA:

- ☐ Mail
- ☐ Courier
- ☐ International Airmail
- ☐ Hand Delivery
- ☒ Will Not Follow
- ☐ With Enclosures
- ☐ Without Enclosures

## Facsimile Transmittal Sheet

### Confidentiality Notice:

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information which may be legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named below. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us; any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited.

TO: Examiner Alexa Doroshenk  
FIRM: USPTO  
FACSIMILE NO.: (703) 872-9428  
FROM: Dan Hart  
APPL. NO.: 09/284,690  
CLIENT CODE: VANM107.001APC  
PAGES: 2 (INCLUDING THIS SHEET)

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL BACK IMMEDIATELY.

MESSAGE: Attached please find proposed claims for discussion in our telephonic interview on May 16th at 1:00 EDT.

Linda H. Liu  
Jeffrey S. Ellsworth  
Andrew N. Merickel, Ph.D.  
Douglas T. Hudson  
David L. Hauser  
Kaare D. Larson  
James F. Merkenhoff  
Scott L. Murray  
Roger S. Shang  
Andrew M. Douglas  
Mare T. Morley  
Salima A. Merani, Ph.D.  
Sam K. Tahmassebi, Ph.D.  
Christy L. Green  
Jalal Sadr  
Jonathan A. Hyman  
Curtiss C. Dossier  
Richard A. DeCrislofaro  
Donna G. Perdue, Ph.D.  
Joseph J. Mallon, Ph.D.  
Joanna L. Dufek  
Thomas P. Krzeminski  
Jeffrey A. Birchak  
Sean M. Murray  
Jason P. Fiorillo  
Elenora Niu  
Valerie L. Bracken  
Samuel K. Simpson  
Johnnie F. Kerlee  
Jeremy P. Sanders  
Ferry D. Oldham  
Jerry L. Helmar  
Russell M. Jorde  
Abraham W. Chuang  
Ryan M. Farr  
Pui Tong Ho  
Erik T. Anderson  
John L. Paik  
Eric K. Morton  
Jesse A. Rothwell  
Marc C. Baumgartner  
Ray B. Hom  
Danielle Klausner  
Kyle F. Schlueter  
Raphael A. Gullórez  
Demian K. Jackson  
Nathan A. Engels

Of Counsel  
Jerry R. Sailer  
Paul C. Steinhart

Japanese Patent Atty  
Katsuhiko Arai  
Tomohisa Sugiyama

European Patent Atty  
Martin Hellebrandt

Korean Patent Atty  
Mincheol Kim  
Hwangsoo Choi

Solicitor (England & Wales)  
J. David Evered

Scientists & Engineers  
(Non-Lawyers)

Raimond J. Salenicks\*\*  
Khurram Rahman, Ph.D.  
Jennifer A. Haynes, Ph.D.\*\*  
Tommy Y. Nagata  
Che S. Chereskin, Ph.D.\*\*  
James W. Ausley\*\*  
Jennifer Hayes  
Kirk E. Pastorian, Ph.D.\*\*  
Charles T. Ridgely  
Bonny Yeung, Ph.D.  
Connie C. Tong, Ph.D.  
Suzanne G. Japson, Ph.D.  
David K. Wiggins  
Megan M. McCoy  
Nira M. Brand  
Catherine M. Sanders  
Jeffrey A. Hopkins  
Tiffany C. Miller  
James W. Chang, Ph.D.  
Marina L. Gorday, Ph.D.  
Ed DesJardins, Ph.D.\*\*  
W. Frank Dauwer  
Lang J. McHardy  
Karen J. Lenker  
Chris B. Wosberg, Ph.D.

\* A Professional Corporation  
† Also Barrister At Law (Eng & Wales)  
\*\* U.S. Patent Agent

620 Newport Center Drive  
Sixteenth Floor  
Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Tel 949-780-0404  
Fax 949-780-0404

201 California Street  
Suite 1150  
San Francisco CA 94111  
Tel 415-954-4114  
Fax 415-954-4111

1900 Avenue of the Stars  
Suite 1425  
Los Angeles CA 90067  
Tel 310-551-3450  
Fax 310-551-3458

3403 Tenth Street  
Suite 700  
Riverside CA 92501  
Tel 951-781-9231  
Fax 951-781-4507

Received from < > at 5/14/02 4:24:39 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

**DRAFT -- NOT FOR ENTRY INTO FILE****Proposed Claims for Discussion**

Appl. No. 09/284,690  
VANM107.001APC

2. (Amended three times) An apparatus for the pyrolysis of waste comprising a rotating cell formed of a cylinder, said cylinder having a diameter and two ends, in combination with a truncated cone rotating on the same axis, said truncated cone having a large base and a small base, said large base and said small base each having a diameter, [a hopper for charging the waste at one end of said cell, an ash box at the other end of said cell, a recovery chimney, in connection with said cell, for recovering pyrolysis gases from said cell, and a retaining threshold between the cylinder and the truncated cone,] the diameter of said cylinder being larger than the diameter of said large base of said truncated cone and projections extending between said large base of said truncated cone and said end of said cylinder which is adjacent to said large base of said truncated cone, said projections forming a retaining threshold and creating a region of intimate contact of the waste with itself,] whereby the waste is converted into coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste, a hopper for charging the waste at one end of said cell, an ash box at the other end of said cell, and a recovery chimney, in connection with said cell, for recovering pyrolysis gases from said cell.

3. (Amended) The apparatus according to Claim 2, wherein the retaining threshold is formed by a difference between the diameter of the cylinder and the diameter of the large base of the truncated cone.

4. (Amended) The apparatus according to Claim 2, wherein the truncated cone further comprises a network of nozzles fed via channels distributing combustion air in a substoichiometric amount, thereby combusting the coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste.

16. (New) An apparatus for the pyrolysis of waste, comprising waste, a rotating cell formed of a cylinder, said cylinder having a diameter and two ends, in combination with a truncated cone rotating on the same axis, said truncated cone having a large base and a small base, said large base and said small base each having a diameter, the diameter of said cylinder being larger than the diameter of said large base of said truncated cone, and projections extending between said large base of said truncated cone and said end of said cylinder which is adjacent to said large base of said truncated cone, said projections forming a retaining threshold and creating a region of intimate contact of the waste with itself whereby the waste is converted into coke which is used as fuel in the pyrolysis of the waste.